REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0224903 to Ginter et al. ("*Ginter*").

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-21, 23-25, and 27. Claims 1-27 are currently pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-27 as allegedly anticipated by *Ginter*.

Independent claim 1, for example, recites an information processing apparatus comprising a "means for transmitting, to [a] license server, a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying one of [an] information processing apparatus and a user of the information processing apparatus." *Ginter* fails to teach or suggest at least the claimed restoring request.

Ginter discloses a "distributed virtual distribution environment (VDE)" including electronic appliances, and the VDE is used to enforce secure handling and control of electronic content (*Ginter*, abstract). *Ginter* further discloses that a user registers with a VDE repository that contains electronic content, and that the repository also contains electronic agreement information indicating usage restrictions on the electronic content (*Ginter*, ¶ 2037). However, while *Ginter* generally discloses restoring databases (*Ginter*, ¶ 1260), *Ginter* does not disclose transmitting a restoring request to a license server, or a restoring request that includes client identifying information. Therefore,

Ginter fails to teach or suggest a "means for transmitting, to [a] license server, a restoring request including client identifying information for identifying one of [an] information processing apparatus and a user of the information processing apparatus" as recited by independent claim 1.

Independent claim 1 also recites a "means for receiving a response to [a] restoring request from [a] license server, the response including usage-right identifying information corresponding to . . .[a] usage right having previously been issued to one of said information processing apparatus and the user [of the information processing apparatus]."

Even assuming *Ginter's* electronic agreement information corresponds to the claimed usage right, *Ginter* does not disclose a restoring request for previously issued electronic agreement information. Therefore, *Ginter* fails to teach or suggest a "means for receiving a response to [a] restoring request from [a] license server, the response including usage-right identifying information corresponding to . . .[a] usage right having previously been issued to one of said information processing apparatus and the user [of the information processing apparatus]" as recited by independent claim 1.

Ginter thus does not anticipate claim 1, and Applicants respectfully request the allowance of claim 1. Although of different scope than claim 1, *Ginter* does not anticipate independent claims 6, 10, 15, 19, and 24 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, claims 7-9 depend from claim 6, claims 11-14 depend from claim 10, claims 16-18 depend from claim 15, claims 20-23 depend from claim 19, and claims 25-27 depend from claim 24. Because *Ginter* does not support the rejection of independent claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), *Ginter* also does not support the rejection of dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16-18, 20-23 and 25-27.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Reply, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 3, 2007   By: _____
                                                  Michael R. Kelly
                                                  Reg. No. 33,921